

UNITED STATE EPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTO	RNEY DOCKET NO.
09/058,323 04/09/98	HOUWEN	В	10690/10168
— BRYAN CAVE	HM32/0516 —	EXAMINER GABEL, G	
245 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10167-0034		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1641	14
		DATE MAILED:	05/16/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/058,323 HOUWEN ET AL.				
•	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Gailene R. Gabel	1641			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 23 April 2001 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applicall) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper re h places the appl	eply to a ication in		
	EPLY [check only a) or b)]				
 a)	o months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (fontinues to run from the mailing date of the	final rejection,			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data are been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens of CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most parened patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the f I statutory period for reply originally set in th	ee. The appropriate en e final Office action; o	xtension fee under r (2) as set forth in		
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37CFF 					
The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon with requisite fees.	the timely submission of a Notic	e of Appeal and A	Appeal Brief		
3. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) M they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search. (s	see NOTE below)	;		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter. (see Note	below);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or	simplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected cla	ims.		
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
4.☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely file	ed amendment		
6. ☐ The a ☐ affidavit, b ☐ exhibit, or c ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does N	OT place the		
7. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which w	ere newly		
8. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s)	is as follows (see attached writter	n explanation, if a	any):		
Claim(s) allowed: NONE.					
Claim(s) objected to: NONE.					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-13</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: NONE.					
9. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on $ u$ a)∏has b)∏ has not been appro	oved by the Exan	niner.		
0. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	<u> </u>	a 0		
1. ☐ Other: LONG V. LE	2 iles	1 K.B.	the		
SUPERVISORY PATENT TECHNOLOGY CENT	EXAMINER / 5/	18/01			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 01-01) Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment to claim 13 fails to overcome the 112 second paragraph rejection set forth in Paper No. 12. Specifically, it is unclear what Applicant's intend to encompass in reciting "the osmolarity of the leucocytes".

Continuation of 6. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: claims 1-13 fail to obviate the pending obviousness rejection over Loken in view of Kim and Inami and Applicant's argument on the Examiner's various reasons for combining the same references, to overcome the rejection is not persuasive.